DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 971 AL 002 696

AUTHOR Wolfram, Walt; Whiteman, Marcia
TITLE The Role of Dialect Interference in Composition.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. Sociolinguistics Program.
PUB DATE Jan 71
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Composition (Literary), Grammar, High School Students, *Interference (Language Learning), Language Styles, *Negro Dialects, *Negro Students, Phonology, Standard Spoken Usage, *Teacher Role, *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Dialect Interference

ABSTRACT

Despite the recent focus on the role of dialect differences in creating learning difficulties for speakers of nonstandard dialects of English, research has tended to concentrate on difficulties related to speaking and reading, while ignoring those involved in teaching writing to these students. This paper attempts to meet the need for such studies by dealing with the role of "dialect interference" in the writing of speakers of one nonstandard dialect, Black English, here defined as the dialect "typically spoken by lower socioeconomic class Blacks and distinguished from other nonstandard dialects by a number of pronunciation and grammar features. "The paper first discusses the notion of dialect interference and how it can be applied to writing and then reports a study conducted by the authors using as their data compositions written by tenth-grade speakers of Black English. These compositions are examined in the light of certain established facts about Black English (both phonological and grammatical) to ascertain the extent to which dialect interference can be used to explain certain phenomena found in the students' writing. The authors conclude that dialect interference does indeed play a role in the writing of Black English speakers and discuss the implications of this conclusion for the compositicn teacher. (FWB)

ED045971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Walt Wolfram
Center for Applied Linguistics
and Federal City College

Marcia Whiteman
Center for Applied Linguistics

January 1971

THE ROLE OF DIALECT INTERFERENCE IN COMPOSITION

American educators have become increasingly confronted with a multitude of language problems in the classroom.[1] Many of these problems stem from the language difficulties which their non-standard English speaking students have in learning how to speak, read and write Standard English. Although there has been disagreement over exactly how different from Standard English these non-standard varieties of English are, many educators and researchers recognize that the difference is great enough to be causing a sufficient number of learning difficulties.

From its inception, much of the educational concern for non-standard English speakers has been directed to the variety of English which has become known as Black English. Black English is typically

AL 002 696

---

[1]We are indebted to our colleagues Ralph W. Fasold, Roger W. Shuy, Irwin Feigenbaum and Dorie Hammerschlag for their invaluable comments on the manuscript.

spoken by lower socioeconomic class blacks and is distinguished from other nonstandard dialects by a number of pronunciation and grammar features. It is important to note that the term Black English does not imply that all American blacks speak it. The speech of many blacks is indistinguishable from others of the same region and social class. It is also important to keep in mind that Black English is a fully formed linguistic system in its own right; it cannot simply be dismissed as an unworthy approximation of Standard English.

Much of the educational interest in Black English has been focused on attempts to teach Black English speakers to speak Standard English. Various methods and techniques have been suggested and used in the teaching of spoken Standard English (see Feigenbaum 1970). Recently, there has been increasing resistance on socio-political grounds to the methodical teaching of spoken Standard English to Black English speakers. Sledd, (1969) views such teaching as a "formal initiation into the linguistic prejudices of the middle class." He suggests that effort should be spent instead on ridding the majority of its prejudices against nonstandard dialects and on teaching the minority to read and write.

Regardless of one's viewpoint concerning the pro's and con's of teaching spoken Standard English to lower class blacks, however, few deny the advantage of knowing how to read and write the standard language. The apparent correlation of reading failure with nonstandard speakers has already led a number of researchers to investigate the role of dialect diversity in learning reading skills (see, for example, Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy, Eds. Teaching Black Children to Read).

Meanwhile, the literature on the role of dialect interference in writing has lagged far behind the published concern about speaking and reading Standard English. The lack of sociolinguistic research and application in writing, however, is not an accurate indication of the problems of many composition teachers dealing with Black English speakers on all levels of education--from elementary language arts teachers trying to get students to express themselves in writing for the first time to college teachers of composition courses.

Several reasons may be cited to account for the paucity of research into dialect interference in writing. Some researchers and educators may be assuming that by teaching lower-class black students to read Standard English, an ability to write Standard English will follow naturally. But in assuming that once a

student learns to read Standard English he will be able to write it, we are denying the differences that exist between productive and receptive language skills. Learning to read or understand a language requires the development of receptive skills, whereas learning to write or speak a language requires the development of productive skills. The ability of many people to learn to read a foreign language without being able to produce it in speech or in writing should be sufficient evidence that the learning of one skill does not necessarily include the learning of the others.

Another possible reason that some educators have not specifically elaborated the writing difficulties that confront Black English speakers may be due to their reticence in singling out a particular ethnic group with a writing problem. They may reason that many students have problems in writing and to focus on one particular minority group is to underestimate the academic potential of that group. They may reason that writing problems are faced by all students more or less equally. However, most composition teachers who have dealt with Black English speakers will perceive certain differences between the writing difficulties of Black English speakers and those of Standard English speakers.

Although the teachers' analyses may not be linguistically sophisticated, even such generalizations as "They leave out their verbs" or "They leave off the ends of words," while technically imprecise, show that they have recognized the different dimension that may exist for the Black English speaker.

The purpose of this paper is to focus specific attention on the nature of this apparent "dialect interference" in the writing of Black English speakers. Although we shall illustrate the different types of interference problems that some lower-class black students may have in writing from a corpus of papers collected by Whiteman in English class, the scope of the paper is intended to be suggestive rather than definitive. We shall attempt to raise the various issues that one has to deal with in investigating language interference in composition, to answer several questions about the nature of this interference, and to point out the possible implications for educational strategy.

Dialect Interference

When a speaker of language variety A, who attempts to produce language variety B deviates from the norms of B as a result of his

structural familiarity with A, we have language interference. Weinreich states:

> The term interference implies the rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system, a large part of the morphology and syntax, and some areas of vocabulary. (Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact, 1953, p. 1)

For example, a German attempting to speak English may pronounce the word thing as sing due to the fact that the th sound found so frequently in English does not exist in the German sound system.

Traditionally, the notion of language interference has been applied to individuals who speak more than one language, but it may just as readily be applied to individuals who attempt to speak more than one variety, or dialect, of a language. It should be noted here that the term "dialect" refers to one variety of a language, and that it implies neither superiority nor inferiority to other varieties of that language; it is simply different from other varieties in parts of its sound system, its grammar and its

vocabulary. Black English, as a variety of English, shares many features with Standard English, but differs from Standard English in several significant areas. When a Black English speaker attempts to produce a Standard English sentence, and, in so doing, deviates from the norms of Standard English as a result of his familiarity with the rules of Black English, we may attribute this deviation to interference. For example, a Black English speaker attempting to produce the Standard English sentence We went over to our friend's house, may instead produce We went over to our friend house, due to the fact that the -s suffix marking possession is not required in Black English.

This is not to say, of course, that any deviation from Standard English norms in speech can be classified as dialect interference. In everyday speech, no one conforms perfectly to his own norms, due to various types of "performance errors" such as false starts and memory lapses. However, when the speech of a socially definable subgroup shows consistent differences from Standard English then we are dealing with language interference and not random "performance error."

Although the notion of language interference has generally been applied to spoken language, the same phenomenon occurs in written language. As we will see in the sample which follows, a great number of writing "errors" or departures from Standard English

norms can be traced to dialect interference. In the sense that the written message is usually a reflection of the spoken one, we may expect written interference to approximate spoken interference. However, we must also realize that there are different dimensions to writing and speaking, and therefore we cannot expect the two types of interference to be identical. For one, there is not always a one-to-one correspondence between linguistic forms in writing and those in speech. For example, there is not always a one-to-one relationship between units of sound and letters of the alphabet; thus th in thing is a case of two letter symbols which represent one sound. Furthermore, the stylistic expectations for writing style are different from even the most formal style of spoken language. Thus, a sentence such as That more than one kind of English is likely to be in use at the same time is a notorious fact, is quite likely to be found in writing, but it is not very likely to be found in speaking. Finally, the types of performance errors which occur in speech are quite different from those which occur in writing. For example, false starts, memory lapes, hesitation phenomena and the like are performance errors which are found in speech. Their counterparts in writing might be such errors as faulty punctuation, non-sequitor participant reference, and certain types of misspellings.

The above discussion should make it clear that we can expect some interference in the writing of the Black English speaker unless there is some specific training to limit its influence in writing. Overcoming this potential dialect interference must be added to the traditional teaching of writing skills, such as logical thought progression, conciseness of expression, and mechanical expertise. Although areas other than dialect interference are in themselves essential in teaching writing skills, we shall here concentrate only on the nature of dialect interference in composition.

A Sample Study

Any study of interference must start with an understanding of the differences and similarities of the languages in contact. Weinreich observes:

> Great or small, the differences and similarities between languages in contact must exhaustively be stated for every domain--phonic, grammatical, and lexical--as a prerequisite to an analysis of interference. (p. 2)

Given the prerequisite knowledge of the two language varieties, there are two basic approaches to the investigation of interference.

We may, on the one hand, predict the potential areas in which we might expect interference based on what we know about the similarities and dissimilarities of the two language varieties in question. Or, on the other hand, we may start with the empirical data, look at those aspects of composition which do not conform to Standard English norms, and decide which of these deviations may be attributed to dialect interference from our knowledge of the indigenous dialect. In actuality, however, we combine these two methods to determine the nature of interference. If we went solely on the basis of looking for predicted interference, we might miss some of the more subtle and indirect aspects of interference. On the other hand, if we went solely on the basis of our empirical data, we might miss important insights about some kinds of dialect interference which could, but actually don't occur.

With the preceding background information in mind, let us turn to some actual data. The data were taken from 19 compositions written by tenth grade black students in a high school located just beyond the District of Columbia in Prince George's County, Maryland. Although no diagnostic tests were given to ascertain the extent to which all of these students were Black English speakers, on the basis of one of the authors' teaching experience in the school there is little doubt that the majority of the black students in the class spoke Black English.

The illustrative features discussed below have all been documented as an integral part of the Black English phonological and grammatical systems (for a semi-technical description of the features of Black English, see Fasold and Wolfram, (1970)). Following is a small sample inventory of grammatical and pronunciation features and the ways in which they may be reflected in the students' attempts to write Standard English compositions.

A. Grammatical Features

1. Third person singular -S

In Standard English, the suffix -s is used to identify the present tense of the verb if the subject of that verb is in the third person singular. In Black English, however, there is generally no such suffix used to identify third person singular present tense verbs. Thus the Black English and Standard English paradigms are:

	Black English		Standard English	
	Singualar	Plural	Singular	Plural
1.	I walk	we walk	I walk	we walk
2.	you walk	you walk	you walk	you walk
3.	he walk; the man walk	they walk; the men walk	he walks; the man walks	they walk the men walk

It is essential to note that the absence of this -s is not carelessly "left off" by speakers of Black English. This suffix is simply not an integral part of their grammatical system.

If this feature interferes in writing then we may expect the absence of -s in written compositions. As the following examples indicate, this is a rather frequently occurring phenomenon in the compositions of these students.

Sometime he go over Linda house

The growling of my stomach remind me of

a sweet tasty lunch

Almost half of the students have at least one instance of this type of interference. When all potential constructions in which third person singular -s should occur in writing are tabulated, 19 percent of these are written without the form -s, as shown in the chart below.

PERCENTAGE OF ABSENCE OF -s THIRD PERSON SINGULAR FORM

Feature	Times Present e.g. he walks	Times Absent e.g. he walk	Total Potential occurrences	% Ab.
3rd sing. -s	82	19	101	19

2. Possessive -s

Another feature characteristically different in Black English and Standard English involves the 's suffix as an indicator of possession. In Standard English, we may form possession by adding an 's as in boy's coat or John's hat. In Black English, however,

the form is often absent, so that possession may be indicated simply by word order, as in boy coat or John hat.

As with -s third person singular, we may again expect interference to be reflected by the absence of 's in writing. The following examples illustrate this type of interference.

> This is in a friend of mine car, my girl friend and I are in her boyfriend car
>
> He stay over Linda house for a little wild until about 5:00. (sic)

Since, in most writing, possessives occur much less frequently than do third person singular forms, we would expect that dialect interference with the possessive would be less noticeable. (For example, in this set of compositions, third person singular forms were used over 10 times more frequently than possessives.) However, even though dialect interference with the possessive is less noticeable, it is apparent from these papers that, with some students, such interference is quite persistent. For example, one student wrote all seven of her possessive forms without the -s.

3. Plural -s

The -s suffixes which mark most plurals in Standard English are occasionally not required in the speech of Black English speakers.

Thus we may get five book and The other teacher, they'll yell at you. The following examples attest to plural interference in the compositions of the students.

> In the afternoon you can see many boy and girls walking the streets with their radio in their hand.
>
> My eye are sparkleing and full of luster... (sic)

Of the 19 students, only four use plural constructions without writing the -s. But these four use uninflected plurals in 44 percent of all plural constructions. This figure is quite high when compared to the percentage of plural absence found in the analyses of Black English speech. For example, studies of lower class black communities in New York, Detroit, and Washington, D.C. reveal figures which are lower than these figures for even the most casual types of speech. Although we might expect the frequencies of writing interference to approximate or be lower than the occurrence of these features in spoken Black English, this feature may be an exception.

4. Absence of the form be

The rules of Black English allow the forms is and are to be deleted. Thus, we can get in Black English forms such as The boy here and He a man corresponding to The boy is here and He is a man.

It appears that the following examples of is or are absence in the compositions of the students can be attributed to dialect interference.

The sun beaming in on a bright sunny morning
and the room is warm and comfortable.

When you out there in the morning you can hear
dogs barking and howing as the sun comes out (sic)

Almost half (eight of nineteen) of the students evidence this type of interference in their compositions. Is and are are deleted in 9% of all the situations in which they might have occurred.

5. Multiple Negation

One of the characteristic ways in which all nonstandard dialects are distinguished from Standard English is by the occurrence of negatives at more than one point in a sentence. Thus Standard English He didn't do anything to anybody is He didn't do nothing to nobody in nonstandard varieties. Although we might expect this type of construction to be characteristic in the compositions, we find that there are no examples of this type of structure in the essays despite the fact that there are a number of places where it might have occurred. This could be due to the fact that this feature is so stereotyped and emphasized as unacceptable English by school teachers that students learn by tenth grade to avoid it in writing (in spite of the fact that it is still maintained in speech).

6. Habitual be

One of the most described and unique features of Black English is the use of the form be in reference to a habitual or repeated activity. The use of be in a sentence such as Sometimes he be at home and sometimes he don't does not correspond to any one grammatical form in Standard English.

There are a number of contexts in which be might have been used in these compositions, but there are no occurrences of be. Although this might be due to the social stigma attached to the use of be as with multiple negation, there may also be some structural reason for this absence. For example, when we compare be and multiple negation, which do not seem to interfere in writing, with third singular, plural, and possessive -s, which do interfere, we notice that in the latter case the interference involves a suffix which can be deleted while in the former there is a complete change of a grammatical item. Deletion of a suffix seems to be considerably more susceptible to interference in attempting to write Standard English than the more extensive kind of grammatical difference involving the complete change of a grammatical item.

B. Pronunciation Features

The examples discussed so far have to do with interference for the grammatical system of Black English. Now let us turn our

attention to interference from the sound system. Whereas grammatical interference might be reflected in several different ways in composition (e.g. different forms, the ordering of forms, etc.), pronunciation interference is revealed in spelling. That is, if we would take all composition problems which might be classified as "mispellings" in a traditional evaluation of essays, we may expect that some of these are patterned representations of influence from Black English. The task for analysis then, is to separate those misspellings which are common to all students who are learning to write from those that can be attributed to patterned influence from Black English phonology.

1. Word-final consonant clusters

When words end in certain types of consonant blends, or clusters (two consonant sounds side-by-side in a word), Black English pronunciation rules allow the final member of the cluster to be eliminated. It is important to distinguish two basic types of clusters affected by this reduction. First of all, clusters in which both members of the cluster belong to the same base word can be reduced, as in the following:

Standard English	Cluster Reduction	Black English
te<u>st</u>	/st/ to /s/	te<u>s</u>'
de<u>sk</u>	/sk/ to /s/	de<u>s</u>'
han<u>d</u>	/nd/ to /n/	han'

Secondly, the reduction also affects final -t or -d sounds when both members of the cluster do not belong to the same base word. For example, the addition to a base word of the past tense suffix -ed results in clusters such as the following: (It is important to note here that although a word like missed is written with a final d, it is pronunced as a t.)

Standard English	Cluster Reduction	Black English
missed	/st/ to /s/	miss'
rammed	/md/ to /m/	ram'

Of the two types of consonant cluster reduction, only the second type, indicated by the absence of -ed where required in Standard English, interferes consistently in the compositions. Thus we frequently get sentences such as the following:

> I also visited the animals and look at the garden that had watermelons big as a bolder. (sic)
>
> It seems to look worried or puzzle about something that I can't make out.

Although clusters of the first type (e.g., tes for test) are consistently reduced in the speech of Black English speakers, we do not find this type of cluster reduced in their writing. On the other hand, clusters of the second type, which are formed by the

addition of -ed, are frequently reduced in the writing of the students. How can we explain the lack of interference in the first case and the obvious interference in the other case? One possible explanation may be that in the second case, what remains after the cluster is reduced is a unit in its own right (e.g., without the -ed added, miss can be a word), whereas in the first case, what remains after the cluster is reduced is not a free unit (e.g., test reduced to tes does not result in a free unit). Thus, consonant clusters formed by the addition of -ed would be more susceptible to interference than those clusters which are a part of the base word.

2. Other types of pronunciation interference

We could list several other pronunciation differences between Black English and Standard English which are reflected in the writing of the students. For example, pin spelled as pen (e.g., Everything is so still you could hear a pen drop) can be attributed to the fact that Black English speakers, and many speakers of standard southern dialects for that matter, pronounce these two words identically. However, on the whole, spelling errors which can be attributed to dialect differences are relatively infrequent in our sample corpus. There are numerous

other types of spelling errors which cannot be related to phonological differences between Black English and Standard English. There is, for example, no dialect-based reason to spell pasture as pastuer, boulder as bolder, or stomach as stomack. We must conclude, then, that traditional "misspellings" such as these are generally not due to dialect interference, but to the same factors which cause all students learning to write English to misspell.

Hypercorrection

Up to this point, we have dealt only with the direct manifestation of dialect interference in writing. But there is another aspect of dialect interference which is a by-product rather than direct evidence of the Black English grammatical and phonological system. This type of interference results from an attempt to produce Standard English units with which the speaker is not completely familiar. Due to this unfamiliarity the writer will sometimes incorporate items not only where they are appropriate in Standard English but in inappropriate places as well, producing what we may call hypercorrection in writing. For example, we find that some writers produce not only -s third person forms on the appropriate verbs in Standard English

(e.g. He likes the girl) but on other than third person singular present tense forms. We thus get sentences such as I kisses him goodbye.

The phenomenon of hypercorrection may show up in spelling as well. The reason for hypercorrect spellings is to be found in the differences between the pronunciation rules of Standard English and the nonstandard dialect. The spelling of wild for while in a sentence like He took us over Linda house for a little wild is an example of a hypercorrect spelling. As we have already explained, the regular rules for dialect pronunciation allow a Black English speaker to pronounce wild as wil'. Nevertheless, by the time he has reached tenth grade, he has been corrected for this kind of pronunciation enough so that he has a vague feeling that it is "incorrect." The pronunciation of while strikes him as an example of the kind of thing he has been corrected for so many times in the past. In his desire to get everything correct in the composition, he carefully gives a spelling which includes the "correct" d. Perhaps a more obvious example of hypercorrection is found in the following example.

I often wonder whither I will mist the bus

but I haven't misted it yet (sic)

In this example, we first observe that the item miss has been hypercorrected to mist to compensate for the frequent reduction of st to s in many items which actually end in st in Standard English. And, in keeping with this hypercorrection in the first spelling of miss as mist, the -ed is added to form misted in the latter part of the sentence.

Although we have not discussed dialect influences on vocabulary in this paper, certain types of hypercorrection can also be evident with respect to vocabulary. Generally classified as "malapropism," this phenomenon involves the inappropriate usage of words in an attempt to write in an educated style. Wayne (1970) cites a number of these types of examples in her discussion of compositions written by lower socio-economic class black students (e.g. The Black Ghetto has recessonal began to unhide itself, ... Kenneth Clark states how black people with education have the attendance to outdo .....)

Conclusions:

In the previous sections we have attempted to demonstrate the fact that dialect interference does play a role in the writing of Black English speakers. It should be obvious that an understanding of the nature of this interference is a prerequisite for the most

efficient teaching of writing skills. An informal investigation of the written compositions of college freshmen from inner-city Detroit by Ralph W. Fuzz reveals that approximately 45% of their misspellings and unacceptable grammatical forms were directly relatable to interference from the pronunciation and grammar of their everyday spoken English. Our emphasis on dialect interference as one aspect of the writing problems of these students should not, however, be taken to mean that other aspects of effective writing should be ignored. The deliberate style called for in writing is quite different from spoken language for any student, and must be taught as a separate communicative skill. A first step in attacking this educational problem is the identification of the various dimensions involved. We have attempted to isolate one dimension for the nonstandard English speaker which has not always been legitimately recognized.

Out limited corpus is sufficient to demonstrate several aspects about the nature of this interference. In the first place, we have seen that all non-standard English linguistic features do not interfere to the same extent. Thus, for example, our corpus of tenth grade compositions revealed little incidence of multiple negation or habitual <u>be</u>. We have hypothesized that in some cases, this may be due to a social awareness that some features are to be avoided

in writing style (although they may be consistently retained in spoken style) because of the social stigma associated with them. Since we are here dealing with tenth grade students, it is possible that they have by now learned that certain features are regarded by the larger society as unacceptable English. (cf. Labov 1964). What we need, however, is age-graded study of interference in writing to determine the types of interference problems which are relevant for different stages in the acquisition of writing skills. For example, we might not expect the dialect interference problems of the tenth grade student to be identical to those of a second grader or of a college student because of the differing levels of social awareness concerning language.

We have also suggested that some types of interference may be more persistently retained because of the inherent nature of the linguistic structures involved. Thus, for example, interference in suffixial forms may persist after interference involving free units is eliminated. Or, pronunciation interference may be reduced before certain types of grammatical interference. It is important to note that interference is not generally categorical. That is, when a particular Black English item interferes in Standard English writing, it does not interfere at every potential place

where it might interfere. Rather, there is fluctuation between a Standard English variant and socially stigmatized variant. This reflects a basic pattern of spoken Black English where non-Standard English items fluctuate with Standard English forms. In general, the incidence of non-standard English forms in writing should be expected to be less frequent than in speech because of the formality of the style. With the possible exception of plurals, this appears to be the case.

As a by-product of the formal, deliberative style called for in writing we also find considerable incidence of hypercorrection. Studies of a continuum of styles by Labov (1964) reveal that the more formal the style the higher the probability of hypercorrection. Thus, the role of certain types of hypercorrection in writing must be considered an essential aspect of interference because of the inherent formality involved in writing. Just as hypercorrection may be an important indicator of linguistic insecurity in certain speech styles, it also may be an indicator of linguistic insecurity in handling a writing code with which a student is unfamiliar.

Although the above description of language interference is by no means exhaustive, there are obvious implications for the composition teacher. First of all, it is essential for the teacher to distinguish the different dimensions of writing problems that a Black English speaker may have. The failure to differentiate

between dialect interference from, say, mechanical difficulties such as spelling or punctuation may lead to confusion for the student. A first step in the solution of educational problems is a correct identification of exactly what the nature of the problems are. Of course, the differentiation of dialect interference from other types of writing difficulties presumes that the teacher knows what the predominant features of the spoken dialect are and how they operate.

The accurate identification of different dimensions of writing problems for lower-class black students may be a first step in setting priorities in the development of writing skills. Thus, theme development may be given first priority at one stage of development, "mechanical" skills emphasis at another stage, and dialect interference at still another stage. Futhermore, the dimension of dialect interference in writing may call for the development of pedogogical materials which are qualitatively different from any available pedogogical materials. We may need to develop written exercises for writing Standard English which in some ways are analagous to the constrastive drills that have been developed for teaching spoken Standard English (Feigenbaum 1970).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy, eds. Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, Urban Language Series, 1969.

Ralph W. Fasold and Walt Wolfram "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect," in Teaching Standard English in the Inner City, Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Irwin Feigenbaum. "Developing Fluency in Standard English," Elementary English, Dec. 1970.

William Labov. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

James Sledd. "Bi-Dialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy," English Journal. Dec. 1969. Vol. 58, number 9, pp. 1307-1329.

Mary C. Wayne. "Black English Features in the Writing Samples of Five College Freshmen: a Linguistic Analysis," unpublished.

Uriel Weinreich. Languages in Contact, Mouton, The Hague, 1953.